

REMARKS

The Office Action of April 23, 2008 was received and carefully reviewed. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the currently pending rejections are requested for the reasons advanced in detail below.

Claims 1-7 and 17-34 were pending prior to the instant amendment, of which claims 4-7 and 23-28 have been withdrawn. By this amendment, claims 1, 17, 20 and 32 are amended and new claims 35-40 have been added. No new matter has been introduced. Consequently, 1-3, 17-22 and 29-40 are currently pending for consideration in the instant application, of which claims 1, 17 and 20 are independent.

In the Office Action, claim 32 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. In response, Applicants have amended claim 32 as suggested by the Examiner to read --said thermal expansion center in members of said frame--. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the 112 rejection be withdrawn.

Further, the Examiner states that claim 32 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in the Office Action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Also, claims 33-34 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Examiner is thanked for the indication of allowable subject matter.

Additionally, claims 1, 3, 17, 19-20, 22 and 29-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,356,686 to Fujioka et al. (hereinafter

Fujioka) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,475,287 to Clark (hereinafter Clark) and claims 2, 18 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujioka and Clark as applied to claims 1, 3, 17, 19-20, 22 and 29-31 above, and further in view of Japanese Patent No. 05-341502A to Sekimoto et al. (hereinafter Sekimoto). These rejections are respectfully traversed at least for the reasons provided below.

Claims 1, 3, 17, 19-20, 22 and 29-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujioka in view of Clark. Fujioka in view of Clark, however, fail to render the claimed invention unpatentable. Each of the claims recite a specific combination of features that distinguishes the invention from the prior art in different ways. For example, independent claim 1 recites a combination that includes, among other things:

a frame bonded to a first surface of said mask body, wherein a material evaporated from a deposition source is deposited on a substrate through said pattern opening of said mask body, said substrate being placed on said first surface of said mask body.

(See, for example, in FIG. 1(B)). Independent claim 17 recites yet another combination that includes, *inter alia*,

a mask frame bonded to a first surface of said mask body, wherein an EL material evaporated from a deposition source is deposited on a substrate through said opening of said mask body, said substrate being placed on said first surface of said mask body.

Independent claim 20 recites a further combination that includes, for instance,

a mask frame bonded to a first surface of said mask body, wherein a material evaporated from a deposition source is deposited on a substrate through said opening of said mask body, said substrate being placed on said first surface of said mask body.

At the very least, the applied references, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest any of these exemplary features recited in independent claims 1, 17 and 20.

Applicants contend that none of the applied prior art references teach or suggest the feature of “said substrate being placed on said first surface of said mask body.” First, Fujioka fails to teach that the substrate, on which a material comprising an organic compound is to be deposited, is placed on the mask body. Second, it would appear that Clark teaches that, even though a frame 22 is bonded to one surface of a mask body 12, a substrate 32 is placed on another surface of the mask body 12 (see, for example, FIG. 5). Third, Sekimoto seem to teach nothing with respect to the positional relationship of a mask body, a frame, and a substrate.

Therefore Applicants contend that the claimed invention cannot be obtained even when the above references are combined, and that the rejections with respect to claims 1, 17 and 20 should be traversed.

For instance, with respect to independent claims 1, 17 and 20, the Examiner asserts that Fujioka discloses “a thin-sheet mask in Figures 3 and 5, comprising: a mask body (2) having a pattern opening; and a frame (1), wherein said mask body is fixed to said frame in a stretched state and said mask body is adhesively bonded (using adhesive 3 at 14) in a location coinciding with a line passing through a thermal expansion center in members (7) of said frame.”

The Examiner attempts to remedy the deficiencies of Fujioka by turning to Clark. The Examiner asserts that Clark discloses “using a mask and frame apparatus for the purpose of permitting selective deposition from a deposition source situated below the mask, frame and a deposition substrate (abstract).” However, Clark fails to disclose or suggest the feature

of the substrate being placed on the first surface of the mask body, as recited in claims 1, 17 and 20.

The Examiner attempts further to remedy the deficiencies of Fujioka and Clark by turning to Sekimoto. The Examiner asserts that Sekimoto discloses “providing a mask frame comprising four corner curvature for the purpose of forming a frame capable of uniformity forming an adhesive layer at the inside face without generating a film breaking at the time of sticking the frame film and without damaging the mask at the time of repairing the frame (abstract).” However, Sekimoto does not disclose or suggest the above feature of the substrate being placed on the first surface of the mask body, as recited in claims 1, 17 and 20.

In accordance with the M.P.E.P. § 2143.03, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 409 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). “All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.” *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 196 (CCPA 1970). Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that neither Fujioka, Clark nor Sekimoto, taken alone or in any proper combination, discloses or suggests the subject matter as recited in claims 1, 17 and 20. Hence, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In addition, it should be noted that new claims 35-40 recite features supported, for example, in line 21, page 13 to line 8, page 14 and FIG. 1(B) of the present application.

Each of the dependent claims depend from one of independent claims 1, 17 or 20 and are patentable over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claims 1, 17 and 20.

In addition, each of the dependent claims also recite combinations that are separately patentable.

In view of the foregoing remarks, this claimed invention, as amended, is not rendered obvious in view of the prior art references cited against this application. Applicants therefore request the entry of this response, the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

In discussing the specification, claims, and drawings in this response, it is to be understood that Applicants in no way intend to limit the scope of the claims to any exemplary embodiments described in the specification and/or shown in the drawings. Rather, Applicants are entitled to have the claims interpreted broadly, to the maximum extent permitted by statute, regulation, and applicable case law.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite issuance of the application, the Examiner is respectfully invited to telephone the undersigned agent at (202) 585-8100.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON PEABODY, LLP

/Sean A. Pryor, Reg. #48103/
Sean A. Pryor

NIXON PEABODY LLP
CUSTOMER NO.: 22204
401 9th Street, N.W., Suite 900
Washington, DC 20004
Tel: 202-585-8000
Fax: 202-585-8080